



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,705	06/27/2003	Martin W. Masters	2003P08280US	9635
759	90 02/24/2006		EXAMINER	
Alexander J. Burke			DABNEY, PHYLESHA LARVINIA	
Intellectual Prop	erty Department			
5th Floor		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
170 Wood Avenue South			2646	
Iselin, NJ 08830			DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/608,705	MASTERS ET AL					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
<b>.</b>	Phylesha L. Dabney	2646					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		=					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o			andonment of				
this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adversaria, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	).						
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expressions.	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal of	of the appeal.				
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	be filed within the time period set fo	orth in 37 CFR 41.37(	(a).				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further contains</li> </ol>			because				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	ow);		the issues for				
appeal; and/or			3 (110 133403 101				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> </ol>		ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		e, timely filed amendn	nent canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	ched.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)  13. Other:	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to the Applicant's first argument that the locking piece (tab) of Narisawa does not protrude outwards from the module, the Examiner disagrees. The locking piece protrudes outward in a downward direction from the module.

With respect to the Applicant's second argument that the locking piece (tab) of Narisawa does not have an orientation gentailly perpendicular to the peripheral surface, the Examiner disagrees. Since the locking piece of Narisawa has essentially a hook configuraton, the lower hooking portion provides a perpendicular orientation.

With respect to the Applicant's third argument that the locking piece (tab) of Narisawa does not have an upper surface generally coplanar with the lower surface of the module, the Examiner disagrees. Since there is at least one point of the locking member that resides in the same plane as at least one point of the lower surface, then the Narisawas reference applies.

With respect to the Applicant's fourth argument that the locking piece (tab) of Narisawa is not in the vicinity of the hinge, the Examiner disagrees. The Narisawa reference is an in the ear hearing aid apparatus. A hearing aid apparatus has to be small enough to fit (usually measured in millimeters) into a user's ear, therefore the Narisawa reference satisfies the broad limitation "in the vicinity of" simply because of the environment and size restraints that are placed on in the ear hearing aids.

With respect to the Applicant's firth argument that the locking piece of Narisawa is not generally coplanar with and adjacent to the inside surface of the housing when the module s seated in the housing, the Examiner disagrees. Locking piece 21A (fig.6) of Narisawa, which engages the locking piece (tab, 27D), is located at an inner side of the housing and thus considered part of the inner surface comprises a hook configuration, the elongated portion is abuts and is perpendicular to the locking piece (tab, 21D)

Because of all of these reasons, the rejection is maintained.

SUPERTENT EXAMINER

SINH TRAN

WALL HUIS

BAINIMAN A TIMET AND TIM